



PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In re application of

Docket No. Q60202

Christian RUQUE

Appln. No. 09/628,442

Group Art Unit: 2827

Confirmation No. 3334

Examiner: DINH, T.

Filed: July 28, 2000

For: A DEVICE FOR PROTECTING A DRAWER ELECTROMAGNETICALLY

SUBMISSION OF APPELLANT'S BRIEF ON APPEAL

Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

Submitted herewith please find an original and two copies of Appellant's Brief on Appeal. A check for the statutory fee of \$320.00 is attached. The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account. A duplicate copy of this paper is attached.

Respectfully submitted,

Billy Carter Raulerson
Registration No. 52,156

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE



23373

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Date: April 3, 2003

RECEIVED
APR - 7 2003
TC 2800 MAIL ROOM



AF 2800
PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In re application of

Docket No. Q60202

Christian RUQUE

Appln. No. 09/628,442

Group Art Unit: 2827

Confirmation No. 3334

Examiner: DINH, T.

Filed: July 28, 2000

For: A DEVICE FOR PROTECTING A DRAWER ELECTROMAGNETICALLY

APPELLANT'S BRIEF ON APPEAL UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.192

Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

In accordance with the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.192, Appellant submits the following, which comprises the Appellant's Brief on Appeal from the Action dated August 27, 2002, wherein claims 1-11 were finally rejected. This Appeal Brief is being filed in triplicate and is accompanied by a Submission which includes the required appeal fee set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(c). Appellant's Notice of Appeal was filed on February 11, 2003. Therefore, the present Appeal Brief is timely filed.

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest is ALSTOM (Assignee) by virtue of an assignment executed by the inventor (Appellant), on July 10, 2000, and recorded by the Assignment Branch of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on October 11, 2000 (at Reel 011203, Frame 0658).

04/04/2003 CNGUYEN 00000100 09628442

01 FC:1402

320.00 0P

RECEIVED
APR -7 2003
2800 MAIL ROOM

APPELLANT'S BRIEF ON APPEAL
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.192
U.S. Application No. 09/628,442
Attorney Docket No. Q60202

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Appellant states that, upon information and belief, Appellant is not aware of any co-pending appeal or interference which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

This is an appeal from the final Office Action dated August 27, 2002, wherein claims 1-11 were finally rejected.

The present application was filed on July 28, 2000 with claims 1-10. Claims 1, 3-4 and 8-10, along with the Abstract, were amended in the Amendment filed on July 3, 2001. Claims 1 and 5 were amended in the Amendment filed on December 27, 2001. Claim 4 was amended and claim 11 was added in the Amendment filed on May 29, 2002. Finally, no claim amendments were made in the Response filed on November 26, 2002.

Thus, claims 1-11 (*see* Attached Appendix) are the claims currently on appeal, from the final rejections as set forth in the Office Action dated August 27, 2002.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

All of the Amendments listed in Section III above have been entered. No Amendments were filed after the Final Office Action dated August 27, 2003.

V. SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

Appellant's invention relates to a device for electromagnetically protecting a drawer equipped with electronics cards (claims 1-11). In particular, the invention provides a device for electromagnetically protecting a drawer equipped with electronics cards, wherein the drawer is suitable for being inserted into a drawer-receiving structure through an opening provided in the

APPELLANT'S BRIEF ON APPEAL
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.192
U.S. Application No. 09/628,442
Attorney Docket No. Q60202

front face of the drawer-receiving structure (claims 1-11). The device includes six faces distributed around said cards, wherein one of the faces of the device is formed by the front face of the drawer, while the other five faces of the device are formed by the side faces, the top face, the bottom face, and the back face of the drawer-receiving structure (claims 1-11). All six faces being electrically conductive (claims 1-11).

Thus, an electromagnetic isolation structure¹ is provided using an unpluggable drawer of which only the front face is treated for electromagnetic compatibility (*see, e.g.*, Appellant's Fig. 1). The remaining electromagnetic protection is provided by the five faces of the drawer-receiving structure, such as a housing (*see, e.g.*, Appellant's Fig. 1). Such drawer-receiving structures usually already have side, top, bottom and back faces, so that the invention does not require major modifications, if any, to be made to existing drawer-receiving structures (Appellant's Specification at page 2, lines 33-36).

An electromagnetic protection function requires no action other than insertion of the drawer into the drawer receiving structure (Appellant's Specification at page 3, lines 1-3). Once the drawer is fully inserted into the drawer-receiving structure, the six faces of the device define a closed volume (*see, e.g.*, Appellant's Fig. 4), inside which the electronics cards of the drawer are disposed and which is isolated electromagnetically from the outside (Appellant's Specification at page 3, lines 3-7).

¹ Such a structure is commonly described as a Faraday Cage.

APPELLANT'S BRIEF ON APPEAL
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.192
U.S. Application No. 09/628,442
Attorney Docket No. Q60202

An exemplary embodiment of Appellant's invention further includes resilient electrical connection means for providing electrical connection between the front face of the drawer and the drawer-receiving structure (claims 2-3). These resilient electrical connection means promote electrical continuity between the front face of the drawer and the faces of the drawer-receiving structure (*see, e.g.*, Appellant's Specification at page 3, lines 28-34; Fig. 4).

Another aspect of Appellant's invention is the inclusion of openings for allowing air to flow through and/or electrical cables to pass through in at least one of the faces of device (claims 4-8 and 11; *see also* Appellant's Fig. 1). Indeed, effective electromagnetic protection can be obtained by means of surfaces that are not necessarily uninterrupted, but rather that are provided with openings of sizes matched to the desired electromagnetic protection (claims 4-8 and 11).

In another exemplary embodiment of Appellant's invention, the drawer-receiving structure can receive a plurality of drawers (claim 9).

Thus, Appellant's invention provides a simpler, more reliable and less costly electromagnetic protection device than currently available, and one that is compatible with a drawer of the unpluggable type (*see, e.g.*, Appellant's Specification at page 2, lines 10-15 and page 3, lines 1-23).

VI. ISSUES

1. Whether independent claim 1, and thus dependent claims 2-11, are indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Appellant regards as the invention, under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

APPELLANT'S BRIEF ON APPEAL
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.192
U.S. Application No. 09/628,442
Attorney Docket No. Q60202

2. Whether claim 1 is anticipated by Aziz et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,949,645 (hereinafter "Aziz"), under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).²

3. Whether claims 2-3 and 9 are unpatentable over the combination of Aziz in view of Anderson et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,209,842 (hereinafter "Anderson"), under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

4. Whether claims 4-8 and 11 are unpatentable over Aziz in view of Porter, U.S. Patent No. 5,808,866 (hereinafter "Porter"), under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

VII. GROUPING OF CLAIMS

Group 1 includes rejected independent claim 1, as well as dependent claims 2-6 and 11, which stand or fall together with their independent base claim. Thus, all of the claims in Group 1 stand or fall together.

Group 2 includes rejected dependent claim 7, which recites separately patentable features (*see* page 17 of Section VIII).

Group 3 includes rejected dependent claim 8, which recites separately patentable features (*see* pages 17-18 of Section VIII).

² Appellant submits that Aziz is not available as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) against Appellant's invention because Aziz was published on September 7, 1999, and thus does not result in Appellant's invention being "patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of the application for patent in the United States" (*see* 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)). Because Aziz may constitute related art under other provisions of 35 U.S.C., however, Appellant addresses the Examiner's allegations that Aziz anticipates claim 1.

APPELLANT'S BRIEF ON APPEAL
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.192
U.S. Application No. 09/628,442
Attorney Docket No. Q60202

Group 4 includes rejected dependent claim 9, which recites separately patentable features (*see* page 15 of Section VIII).

Group 5 includes rejected dependent claim 10, which recites separately patentable features (*see* Final Office Action dated August 27, 2002, page 8 -- Allowable Subject Matter). Indeed, Appellant notes that dependent claim 10 is not rejected under any applied art, but only stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, because it depends from rejected claim 1.

VIII. ARGUMENTS

Appellant respectfully requests the members of the Board to reverse the aforementioned rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, because the claims are sufficiently definite. Additionally, Appellant respectfully requests the members of the Board to reverse the aforementioned rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) because the cited reference fails to disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention. Furthermore, Appellant respectfully requests the members of the Board to reverse the aforementioned rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) because the cited references, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the various features of the claimed invention, nor has the Examiner provided a reasonable suggestion or motivation for combining the references.

1. Claims 1-11 are Sufficiently Definite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

The Examiner alleges that claims 1-11 are indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

APPELLANT'S BRIEF ON APPEAL
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.192
U.S. Application No. 09/628,442
Attorney Docket No. Q60202

Appellant regards as the invention. The Examiner continues to be troubled by the language "said faces being electrically conductive", as recited in claim 1.

In many instances, the Examiner has requested that Appellant amend claim 1 to recite "said faces being formed to be electrically conductive". *See, e.g.*, page 2 of the Office Action dated April 15, 2002. However, since claims 1-11 satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, Appellant does not believe changes to the claim language are necessary. Indeed, it appears that the Examiner's focus may be misplaced. *See, e.g.*, MPEP § 2173.02.

Furthermore, the Examiner's proposed changes may unnecessarily limit Appellant's claimed invention. For example, electrical conductivity can be a natural property of a material (*e.g.*, iron), such that no "forming" is required.

With respect to the recitation "said faces being electrically conductive", in an effort to assist the Examiner's understanding, Appellant referenced Fig. 1 as an illustrative non-limiting example. Claim 1 requires that each face (front face 4, side plates 12, top plate 13, bottom plate 14, and back face 19) be electrically conductive. Indeed, Appellant's specification discloses that elements (faces) 12, 13, 14 and 19 are electrically conductive (*i.e.* conductors), and as a result of being assembled together, are electrically connected together. *See* page. 8, lines 1-3. Thus, with respect to the claimed device, Appellant's specification clearly indicates that the electrical continuity between the various surfaces of the claimed invention form a volume V that is electromagnetically isolated. *See* page 9, lines 2-4 and Fig. 4. Additionally, Appellant's

APPELLANT'S BRIEF ON APPEAL
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.192
U.S. Application No. 09/628,442
Attorney Docket No. Q60202

specification recognizes that a "gap" could pose a potential site of "electromagnetic leakage."

See page 6, lines 34-37.

For at least the above exemplary reasons, the language of claims 1-11 is sufficiently definite to clearly define the metes and bounds of the claimed invention to one of ordinary skill in the art. Thus, claims 1-11 satisfy the requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, that the claims particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Appellant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 1 is not Anticipated by Aziz under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Aziz describes an improved electronic unit that seeks to avoid or minimize the disadvantages of other units, including the large amount of occupied space, the restricted accessibility to internal components, and the awkward placement/disposition of cables and/or conductors therein. *See* col. 1 of Aziz. Aziz, however, is silent as to electromagnetically protecting a drawer equipped with electronics cards, as recited in claim 1. Therefore, not surprisingly, Aziz fails to disclose all of the features recited in claim 1.

For example and not by way of limitation, even assuming *ad arguendo* that the Examiner's characterizations of the unit 10 (*see* Fig. 1 of Aziz) as a device for receiving and protecting a drawer and the carrier 20 (*see* Fig. 1 of Aziz) as a drawer are accurate, Aziz nevertheless fails to disclose that one of the faces of the device is formed by the front face of a drawer, as recited in claim 1. To the contrary, Aziz discloses a front cover 24 that is located in front of the two carriers 20/22 and that is connected to a housing 12 surrounding the carriers

APPELLANT'S BRIEF ON APPEAL
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.192
U.S. Application No. 09/628,442
Attorney Docket No. Q60202

20/22. *See, e.g.*, Fig. 1 and col. 4, line 67 to col. 5, line 7 of Aziz. Indeed, Aziz notes that this cover 24 can be lowered for access to the carriers 20/22. *See, e.g.*, col. 5, lines 6-7.

The Examiner makes a general reference to Fig. 2 of Aziz as disclosing this feature. However, Fig. 2 shows the aforementioned front cover 24, in a lowered position. Thus, Aziz discloses a front cover (face) belonging to the housing 12 and not the drawer 20.

Furthermore, Aziz fails to disclose that the six faces of the device are electrically conductive, as recited in claim 1. To the contrary, Aziz discloses that the aforementioned front cover (face) is plastic. *See, e.g.*, col. 4, line 67 to col. 5, line 3 of Aziz. Thus, Aziz discloses a front cover (face) that is non-conductive.

Therefore, independent claim 1 is not anticipated by (*i.e.*, are not readable on) Aziz under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), at least for the reasons set forth above.

3. Claims 2-3 and 9 are Patentable over Aziz in view of Anderson under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 2-3 and 9 were finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Aziz in view of Anderson. However, the aforementioned deficiencies of Aziz (*see supra* VII(2)) are not remedied by any combination of Aziz in view of Anderson.

Claim 2

While the Examiner acknowledges that Aziz fails to teach or suggest a resilient electrical connection means for providing electrical connection between the front face of the drawer and the drawer-receiving structure, as recited in claim 2, the Examiner alleges that Anderson

APPELLANT'S BRIEF ON APPEAL
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.192
U.S. Application No. 09/628,442
Attorney Docket No. Q60202

discloses a device comprising the resilient electrical connection means. The Examiner alleges that the damping devices 405/600 disclose this connection means. *See* Figs. 4 and 5; col. 3, line 65 of Anderson.

Anderson describes these damping devices 405/600 as engaging the top and bottom walls to provide for the damping of vibrations in the carrier and prevent vibrations in the chassis from transmitting to the carrier. *See, e.g.*, col. 4, lines 19-22 of Anderson. Anderson describes the damping devices 405/600 as exerting a static force of about six pounds while in the cabinet. *See, e.g.*, col. 4, lines 22-24 of Anderson. Anderson fails to teach or suggest that these damping devices provide an electrical connection between the front face of the drawer and the drawer-receiving structure, as recited in claim 2.

Indeed, the Examiner relies on col. 4, line 33 of Anderson in alleging that damping devices 405/600 provide an electrical connection because they can be made of metal. However, the Examiner appears to be mischaracterizing Anderson. Anderson describes a damping device 405/600 as generally consisting of a top element 601, a bottom element 603, and a viscoelastic element 605. *See, e.g.*, Fig. 6 of Anderson. Anderson indicates that the top element 601 and the bottom element 603 may be formed from metal. *See, e.g.*, col. 4, lines 31-34 of Anderson. However, Anderson also indicates that the top element 601 and the bottom element 603 may be formed from plastic. *See, e.g.*, col. 4, lines 31-34 of Anderson. Thus, the conductivity of the top element 601 and the bottom element 603 is not a consideration in Anderson. This is not surprising given that, as discussed above, the damping devices 405/600 serve to prevent

APPELLANT'S BRIEF ON APPEAL
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.192
U.S. Application No. 09/628,442
Attorney Docket No. Q60202

vibrations in the chassis from transmitting to the carrier. *See, e.g.*, col. 4, lines 19-22 of Anderson.

Additionally, the damping devices 405/600 of Anderson include a viscoelastic element 605 between the top element 601 and the bottom element 603. *See, e.g.*, Fig. 6 of Anderson. There is no teaching or suggestion in Anderson that this viscoelastic element is electrically conductive. Thus, since there is no teaching or suggestion that the top element 601 and the bottom element 603 are electrically connected, it follows that there is no teaching or suggestion that the damping devices 405/600 constitute "a resilient electrical connection means for providing electrical connection between the front face of the drawer and the drawer-receiving structure", as recited in claim 2.

Furthermore, because the objective of Anderson is to provide a device for a common carrier to absorb vibration transmissions from a disk drive file to other co-located disk drive files and to minimize self-induced vibration problems (*see, e.g.*, col. 2, lines 7-10 of Anderson), and because this objective is met by the non-electrically conductive damping devices of Anderson, the Examiner appears to be employing impermissible hindsight to read a recitation of Appellant's invention into Anderson.

As the Federal Circuit recently reminded us, the USPTO is held to a *rigorous* standard when trying to show that an invention would have been obvious in view of the combination of two or more references. *See, In re Sang Su Lee*, 2002 U.S. App. LEXIS 855, *10 (Fed. Cir. 2002), *citing, e.g., In re Dembiczak*, 175 F.3d 994, 999, 50 USPQ2d 1614, 1617 (Fed. Cir. 1999)

APPELLANT'S BRIEF ON APPEAL
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.192
U.S. Application No. 09/628,442
Attorney Docket No. Q60202

("Our case law makes clear that the best defense against the subtle but powerful attraction of a hindsight-based obviousness analysis is rigorous application of the requirement for a showing of the teaching or motivation to combine prior art references.").

The Federal Circuit goes on to emphasize that the "need for specificity pervades this authority." *In re Sang Su Lee* at *10-*11 (emphasis added) (citing *In re Kotzab*, 217 F.3d 1365, 1371, 55 USPQ2d 1313, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2000) ("particular findings must be made as to the reason the skilled artisan, with no knowledge of the claimed invention, would have selected these components for combination in the manner claimed"))).

Appellant respectfully submits that the current grounds of rejection do not satisfy the Federal Circuit's standard for demonstrating that the claimed invention would have been obvious in view of the combination of Aziz in view of Anderson.

Additionally, even assuming *ad arguendo* that Anderson does disclose a device comprising resilient electrical connection means, the Examiner's conclusory statement that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use any such resilient electrical means taught by Anderson in the device of Aziz in order to reduce vibration transmitted when a module is inserted into a chassis of the device does not make sense. Aziz is directed to an improved electronic unit that seeks to avoid or minimize the disadvantages of other units, including the large amount of occupied space, the restricted accessibility to internal components, and the awkward placement/disposition of cables and/or conductors therein. *See* col. 1 of Aziz. However, Anderson is directed to providing a device for

APPELLANT'S BRIEF ON APPEAL
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.192
U.S. Application No. 09/628,442
Attorney Docket No. Q60202

absorbing vibration transmissions from a disk drive file to other co-located disk drive files and for minimizing self-induced vibration problems. *See, e.g.*, col. 1, line 6, col. 2, line 10 of Anderson. Thus, an incongruity arises (which is further evidence of an impermissible hindsight analysis on the part of the Examiner) in attempting to combine the teachings of Anderson, which is directed to a vibration problem relating to disk drives (*e.g.*, caused by the rotational energy of a hard disk drive actuator), with the improved electronic unit of Aziz, which indicates no vibration problem.

For at least the above reasons, Appellant submits that the Examiner fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness by demonstrating some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Additionally, even assuming *ad arguendo* that a valid suggestion or motivation exists for combining the references, the combination of Aziz in view of Anderson still fails to teach or suggest the various features of the claimed invention, as discussed above.

Claim 3

Dependent claim 3 is patentable over the combination of Aziz in view of Anderson at least by virtue of its dependency from claim 2 and the additional limitations recited therein. For example, and not by way of limitation, the combination Aziz and Anderson fails to teach or suggest that the resilient electrical connection means is formed by electrically-conductive springs, as recited in claim 3. The Examiner merely cites to Figs. 4 and 5 of Anderson as

APPELLANT'S BRIEF ON APPEAL
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.192
U.S. Application No. 09/628,442
Attorney Docket No. Q60202

illustrating the aforementioned damping means 405/600. Anderson does disclose that a damping device may include two stainless steel springs. *See* col. 6, lines 37-39 of Anderson. However, Anderson also discloses that the springs are laminated together with a viscoelastic material which, as discussed above, certainly removes any ability to assume an electrically-conductive ability of the springs. *See, e.g.*, col. 6, lines 37-39 of Anderson.

Also, as discussed above for claim 2, no proper motivation to combine the teachings of Aziz and Anderson exists.

Claim 9

Claim 9 is patentable over the combination of Aziz in view of Anderson because, for example, the combination of Aziz and Anderson fails to teach or suggest that drawer-receiving recesses for two adjacent drawers are separated by an intermediate electrically-conductive plate suitable for creating electromagnetic isolation between the two recesses, as recited in claim 9. The Examiner cites to Fig. 1 as showing an intermediate plate that separates the two modules. *See* Fig. 1 of Anderson. However, Anderson fails to teach or suggest that these bay-forming walls are electrically conductive as required by claim 9.

Furthermore, Anderson fails to teach or suggest that these bay-forming walls are suitable for creating electromagnetic isolation. For example, the walls clearly have openings. *See* Fig. 1 of Anderson. However, Anderson fails to address the relationship between these openings and the electromagnetic waves from which isolation is required.

APPELLANT'S BRIEF ON APPEAL
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.192
U.S. Application No. 09/628,442
Attorney Docket No. Q60202

For at least these reasons, Anderson fails to teach or suggest an intermediate electrically-conductive plate suitable for creating electromagnetic isolation between two recesses, as recited in claim 9.

Also, as discussed above for claim 2, no proper motivation to combine the teachings of Aziz and Anderson exists.

Therefore, claim 2-3 and 9 are patentable over Aziz and Anderson under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), at least for the reasons set forth above.

4. Claims 4-8 and 11 are Patentable over Aziz in view of Porter under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 4-8 and 11 were finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Aziz in view of Porter. However, the aforementioned deficiencies of Aziz (*see supra* VII(2)) are not remedied by any combination of Aziz in view of Porter. Therefore, claims 4-8 and 11 are patentable over any combination of Aziz in view of Porter at least by virtue of their dependency and because of the additional recitations recited therein.

Claim 5

For example and not by way of limitation, the combination of Aziz and Porter fails to teach or suggest that "said back face is a grating provided with openings for passing cables for connecting to said connectors of said structure", as recited in claim 5. The Examiner acknowledges that Aziz fails to teach or suggest this feature of claim 5. However, the Examiner relies on Figs. 2 and 5 of Porter, in alleging that Porter makes up for this deficiency of Aziz.

APPELLANT'S BRIEF ON APPEAL
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.192
U.S. Application No. 09/628,442
Attorney Docket No. Q60202

With respect to Figs. 2 and 5 of Porter, no openings are illustrated on the backplane 24 for passing cables through. While Fig. 5 of Porter illustrates electrical cables connected to feed-throughs 42 in the front panel, Porter expressly teaches away from having any openings in the panels in order to avoid the entry of dust, moisture, and other contaminants into the system. *See, e.g.,* col. 10, lines 13-21 of Porter. Indeed, Porter describes a container for enclosing electronic modules/equipment for use in harsh military and commercial environments, wherein any openings would likely degrade the ability of the container to protect its contents within the aforementioned harsh environments. *See, e.g.,* Abstract of Porter.

Claim 7

Furthermore, the combination of Aziz and Porter fails to teach or suggest that the sum of the areas of the openings in each of the top and bottom faces is approximately equal to the area through which air can pass vertically in said drawer, as recited in claim 7. The Examiner relies on Fig. 2 of Porter as allegedly disclosing this limitation. Porter does disclose ventilated top and bottom panels. *See, e.g.,* Fig. 2; col. 10, lines 53-56 of Porter. However, Porter fails to teach or suggest any relationship between the sums of the openings and the area through which air can pass vertically in the drawer, as recited in claim 7.

Claim 8

Additionally, the combination of Aziz and Porter fails to teach or suggest that a maximum linear dimension of said openings is considerably smaller than a minimum wavelength

APPELLANT'S BRIEF ON APPEAL
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.192
U.S. Application No. 09/628,442
Attorney Docket No. Q60202

of electromagnetic waves from which said drawer is to be isolated, as recited in claim 8. The Examiner acknowledges that the combination fails to teach or suggest this recitation, but alleges it would have been obvious to employ openings of a size compared with the wavelength of the electromagnetic waves since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *Citing In re Boesch and Slaney*, 205 U.S.P.Q. 215 (C.C.P.A. 1980). Unlike the claimed invention of *In re Boesch*, which overlapped ranges disclosed by the prior art, the Examiner makes no showing that the structure recited in Appellant's claim 8 wherein the maximum linear dimension of the openings is considerably smaller than a minimum wavelength of electromagnetic waves from which the drawer is to be isolated is taught or suggested by the prior art. Thus, the Examiner fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for claim 8. *See* MPEP § 2143.

Therefore, claim 4-8 and 11 are patentable over Aziz and Porter under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), at least for the reasons set forth above.

IX. CONCLUSION

In Summary, Appellant has invented a novel device for protecting a drawer electromagnetically, which is not anticipated by nor rendered obvious by the applied references, either alone or in combination. Thus, Appellant respectfully requests the members of the Board to reverse the final rejections of the appealed claims and to find the claims sufficiently definite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

APPELLANT'S BRIEF ON APPEAL
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.192
U.S. Application No. 09/628,442
Attorney Docket No. Q60202

The present Brief on Appeal is being filed in triplicate. Unless a check is submitted herewith for the fee required under 37 C.F.R. §1.192(a) and 1.17(c), please charge said fee to Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Billy Carter Raulerson
Registration No. 52,156

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE



23373

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Date: April 3, 2003

APPENDIX

CLAIMS 1-11 ON APPEAL:

1. (Twice Amended) A device for electromagnetically protecting a drawer equipped with electronics cards, said drawer for being inserted into a drawer-receiving structure through an opening provided in a front face of said drawer-receiving structure, said device comprising six faces distributed around said cards, wherein one of said faces of said device is formed by a front face of said drawer, while the five other faces of said device are formed by two side faces, a top face, a bottom face, and a back face of said drawer-receiving structure, said faces being electrically conductive.
2. A device according to claim 1, further comprising resilient electrical connection means for providing electrical connection between said front face of said drawer and said drawer-receiving structure.
3. (Amended) A device according to claim 2, wherein said resilient electrical connection means are formed by electrically-conductive springs disposed on edges of said opening provided in the front face of the structure, and/or on said drawer.
4. (Twice Amended) A device according to claim 1, wherein at least one of said faces is provided with openings for at least one of allowing air to flow through and allowing electrical cables to pass through.
5. (Amended) A device according to claim 4, wherein, in the vicinity of said back face, said drawer-receiving structure is provided with connectors suitable for cooperating with connectors

secured to said cards, and wherein said back face is a grating provided with openings for passing cables for connecting to said connectors of said structure.

6. A device according to claim 4, wherein said top and bottom faces are formed by plates provided with air-flow openings.

7. A device according to claim 6, wherein the sum of the areas of the openings in each of said top and bottom faces is approximately equal to the area through which air can pass vertically in said drawer.

8. (Amended) A device according to claim 4, wherein a maximum linear dimension of said openings is considerably smaller than a minimum wavelength of electromagnetic waves from which said drawer is to be isolated.

9. (Amended) A device according to claim 1, wherein said structure is suitable for receiving a plurality of drawers, wherein drawer-receiving recesses for two adjacent drawers are separated by an intermediate electrically-conductive plate suitable for creating electromagnetic isolation between said two recesses.

10. (Amended) A device according to claim 9, wherein said intermediate plate is provided with openings for allowing air to flow through and/or for enabling electrical cables to pass through, and wherein said intermediate plate carries resilient means for establishing electrical connection with the front faces of drawers received in said two recesses.

11. A device according to claim 1, wherein a plurality of said faces are provided with openings for at least one of allowing air to flow through and allowing electrical cables to pass through.